



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/809,440	03/15/2001	Gareth Hougham		4926

7590 05/19/2005
Thomas A. Beck
26 Rockledge Lane
New Milford, CT 06776

EXAMINER

FONTAINE, MONICA A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1732

DATE MAILED: 05/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/809,440

Applicant(s)

HOUGHAM, GARETH

Examiner

Monica A. Fontaine

Art Unit

1732

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 March 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4 and 7-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4 and 7-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 April 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This office action is in response to the Amendment filed 9 March 2005.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 4, 7, and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muller (U.S. Patent 5,770,140), taken with Ciullo's "The Rubber Formulary", in view of Domeier et al. (U.S. Patent 6,422,528). Regarding Claim 1, Muller shows that it is known to carry out a method of making an article, the method substantially eliminating pattern distortion of said article formed as a result of the method (Column 3, lines 35-37), comprising inserting a blend of polysiloxane oligomer-siloxane monomer elastomer reactive-mix into an enclosed mold (Column 2, lines 53-67; Column 3, lines 35-37); retaining said blend of polysiloxane oligomer-siloxane monomer elastomer reactive-mix in said enclosed mold to maintain a precise dimension during a two phase curing process (Column 47-50; It is noted by the examiner that by being in an enclosed mold, the retained mix therein will naturally maintain the precise dimension of the mold cavity.), comprising substantially curing and crosslinking said blend of polysiloxane oligomer-siloxane monomer elastomer reactive-mix in said enclosed mold for a period of 90

Art Unit: 1732

minutes at substantially constant room temperature to form an article (Table II, t90 (min)), wherein the pattern geometry of said article so-formed is not distorted (Column 3, lines 35-45); followed by a subsequent cure of said substantially cured blend of polysiloxane oligomer-siloxane monomer elastomer reactive-mix in said enclosed mold at a temperature of which is higher than said substantial end-use temperature of said article formed from said blend of polysiloxane oligomer-siloxane monomer elastomer reactive-mix and is sufficient to provide required dimensional integrity for pattern faithfulness and subsequent cure is sufficient to harden said elastomer reactive mix to a desired elastic modulus (Column 2, lines 47-50; Column 3, lines 35-45; Table II), said two phase curing in an enclosed mold preventing permanent shrinkage of said article formed from said siloxane polymeric elastomer reactive mix (Column 2, lines 47-50; Column 3, lines 35-42; It is noted by the examiner that by being cured in an enclosed mold, the retained mix therein will be prevented from experiencing permanent shrinkage.); removing said cured article from said blend of polysiloxane oligomer-siloxane monomer elastomer reactive-mix from the enclosed mold after completion of said two phase curing process and forming a desired article, as a result of the two phase curing steps in said enclosed mold having minimal pattern distortion, being a flexible and soft elastomeric article (Column 3, lines 38-41; Table II, Hardness Values). When taken with Ciullo's "The Rubber Formulary", it is reiterated that Muller shows the formation of a flexible and soft elastomeric article (See Page 90-91: Muller's hardness values are between those of a rubber band and tire tread which are both soft and flexible), and that Muller shows a first cure time of 90 minutes (See Pages 84 and 88 for explanation of t90). Muller does not show the specifically-claimed temperatures and making a stamp for microcontact printing. Domeier et al., hereafter "Domeier," show that it is known to

Art Unit: 1732

carry out a method for making a stamp for microcontact printing, wherein processing temperatures while making a stamp article are between 75°C and 200°C (Column 6, line 42; Column 7, lines 7-10; It is noted that Domeier's temperature is "about" which is being interpreted as +/- 40 degrees.) and wherein a stamp for microcontact printing is made from polymeric materials (Column 8, lines 55-67, i.e. "other miniaturized devices"). Domeier and Muller are combinable because they are concerned with a similar technical field, namely, that of molding methods which use enclosed molds to form micro-scale articles. It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select a processing temperature from those disclosed by Domeier to make a microcontact stamp with Muller's process and materials in order to form a stamp which possesses the desired properties (e.g. hardness, geometry).

Regarding Claim 4, Muller shows the process as claimed as discussed in the rejection of Claim 1 above, wherein said blend of polysiloxane oligomer-siloxane monomer elastomer reactive-mix in an enclosed mold is a vinyl addition-type siloxane two-component mixture (Column 2, lines 53-67), meeting applicant's claim.

Regarding Claim 7, Muller shows the process as claimed as discussed in the rejection of Claims 1 and 4 above, but he does not specifically show wiring dimensions of the formed article. Domeier shows that it is known to carry out a method of manufacturing a stamp wherein wiring and other interior features' dimensions contained therein are microscopically small and registration of subsequent layers of such display is within microns over many inches (Column 6, lines 4-12; Column 7, lines 52-67). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary

Art Unit: 1732

skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Domeier's dimensions in Muller's process in order to produce an article according to a desired specification.

Regarding Claim 8, Muller shows the process as claimed as discussed in the rejection of Claim 1 above, but he does not show manufacturing a microelectronic pattern. Domeier shows that it is known to carry out a method of manufacturing a microelectronic stamp (Column 1, lines 23-29). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Muller's process to make Domeier's microelectronic stamp in order to make the stamp in the most efficient manner possible.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muller and Domeier, as applied to claims 1 and 4 above, further in view of Sangokoya (U.S. Patent 5,731,253). Muller shows the process as claimed as discussed above, but does not show the specifically-claimed monomeric moieties. Sangokoya shows that it is known to use a siloxane system that contains moieties of hexamethylcyclotrisiloxane and hexamethyldisiloxane (Column 10, line 31). Sangokoya and Muller are combinable because they are concerned with a similar technical field, namely, that of siloxane compounds and their applicability. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Sangokoya's specific siloxane system moiety as the elastomeric reactive material in Muller's and Domeier's molding process in order to produce an article having characteristics of the molded moiety.

Art Unit: 1732

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muller and Domeier, as applied to claims 1 and 4 above, further in view of Kim (U.S. Patent 5,512,131). Muller shows the process as claimed as discussed above, but does not show using a specific siloxane system. Kumar teaches that it is known to use Sylgard[®], a polydimethylsiloxane widely-known in the art, as the silxane system (Column 8, line 53). Kumar and Muller are combinable because they are concerned with a similar technical field, namely, that of molding processes which use siloxanes as the molding materials. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Kumar's Sylgard[®] as the elastomeric reactive system in Muller's and Domeier's molding process in order to create a stamp with characteristics of molded Sylgard[®].

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 9 March 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant contends that Muller does not teach the instant invention because Muller does not teach exacting precise and exact dimensions of an article. This is not persuasive because applicant does not claim maintaining exact dimensions, only that a pattern is not distorted.

Applicant seems to contend that Muller does not show a two-step curing process, with one cure at room temperature and a second cure between 50C and 120C. This is not persuasive because Muller in fact shows a two-step curing process (See Table II, "P.C."), and although his first given temperature may be higher than some "rooms", a specific temperature regarded as

Art Unit: 1732

“room temperature” was never given. Thus, practically any temperature can be described as “room temperature”, as a room could be heated to practically any temperature. Furthermore, he was not cited to show the temperature of the second stage of curing.

Applicant contends that Muller does not show the instant invention because he uses fillers. This is not persuasive because applicant’s current claim language is in “open” form which does not exclude elements that are not found in the claim.

Applicant contends that the idea of maintaining precise dimensions is not known in the art. It is again noted that the current claim does not require maintaining precise dimensions, only that an article pattern is not distorted. It is maintained by the examiner that it is known that in a closed mold that the article will maintain its shape and general size, otherwise injection molding would be an ineffective method of manufacturing an article to end-use specifications. For evidence of the examiner’s position, see the attached excerpt from “The Injection Molding Handbook”.

Applicant contends that Domeier does not teach the instant invention because he does not show siloxane compounds. This is not persuasive because Domeier is not cited to show that limitation.

Applicant contends that Domeier does not teach the instant invention because he does not show a cure time of one week. This is not persuasive because that time of “one week” is at the end of the claimed range. Domeier does in fact show a time frame that is within the claimed time range.

Art Unit: 1732

Applicant contends that Muller does not teach the instant invention because his article will undergo significant shrinkage at his curing temperature. This is not persuasive because there is no indication of that event, and an attorney's arguments cannot take the place of evidence in the record (MPEP 2145).

Applicant requests that the Ciullo publication be withdrawn from the rejection, as applicant has submitted a declaration noting previous conception of his invention. This is not persuasive because the Ciullo publication was not cited as part of the rejection. The Ciullo publication was cited solely as evidence of the examiner's position.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 1732

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Monica A. Fontaine whose telephone number is 571-272-1198.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mike Colaianni can be reached on 571-272-1196. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Maf

Maf
May 16, 2005



MICHAEL P. COLAIANNI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER